

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 2 and 13 are amended.

Rejection of Claims 1-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejects claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims now comply with 35 U.S.C. §101. Notably, claim 1 is amended to recite that the processor clusters the non-context tokens into a cluster tree based on the frequency vectors according to a lexical correlation among the non-context tokens, wherein the cluster tree is used in a pattern recognition system. Certainly, a system that recognizes patterns such as speech patterns is a practical application that produces tangible and concrete results.

Claim 2 is amended to recite a similar amendment to claim 1 in which the method of grammar learning from a corpus includes the step of clustering the non-context tokens based upon the frequency vectors according to a lexical correlation among the non-context tokens, wherein the cluster tree is used in a pattern recognition system. Accordingly, method claim 2 is patentable and complies with 35 U.S.C. §101.

Similarly, claim 13 is amended to recite that the file is created according to a method that includes storing the non-context tokens and a representation of the clusters in a file for use in a pattern recognition system. Again, the use of such stored non-context tokens and a representation of the clusters in a file for a pattern recognition system provides the requisite practical application for the invention of claim 13.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 2 and 13 each now recite subject matter that complies with 35 U.S.C. §101 and therefore these claims, as well as their dependent claims, are patentable and in condition for allowance.

Double-Patenting Rejections

The Office Action rejects claims 1-20 provisionally on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of Patent No. 6,751,584 and Patent No. 6,317,707. The enclosed Terminal Disclaimer addresses the double patenting rejections. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections and objections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If necessary, the Commissioner for Patents is authorized to charge or credit the **Novak, Druce & Quigg, LLP, Account No. 14-1437** for any deficiency or overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 25, 2007

By: 

Correspondence Address:

Thomas A. Restaino
Reg. No. 33,444
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Thomas M. Isaacson

Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,166
Phone: 410-286-9405
Fax No.: 410-510-1433